DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 164 023 JC 790 024

AUTHOR O'Banion, Terry
TITLE Organizing Staff Development Programs That Work.
INSTITUTION American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 78
NOTE 31p.
AVAILABLE FROM American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, One Dupont Circle, N. W., Washington, D. C. 20036 ($5.00)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Community Colleges; *Faculty Development; Financial Needs; Financial Support; Guidelines; *Inservice Programs; Inservice Teacher Education; *Junior Colleges; Needs Assessment; *Program Development; Program Evaluation; *Staff Improvement; Staff Orientation

ABSTRACT

Guidelines in organizing a staff development program in a community college are outlined. Initially, some kind of assessment must be made to determine program needs. Four areas to assess include: (1) administrative views and support; (2) present level of staff development activities; (3) institutional and personal/professional needs; and (4) internal and external resources available to the institution. A statement of philosophy for the staff development program should be developed and approved by those for whom the program is designed. The organization of the program must be appropriate to the limitations and resources of the institution. This organization can include an advisory committee, a full-time coordinator, and the college staff members themselves. A wide variety of activities including development of program materials, methods of improving instruction, and off-campus meetings must be designed to meet the various needs of all the constituencies represented in the institution. Appropriate incentives and rewards must also be made available to the participants. An adequate level of funding is needed for the successful implementation of the program. Finally, there must be an evaluation of the overall program, including indications of improvement in the development of individual staff members. (Author/MB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED164023

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

William A. Harper

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ORGANIZING STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS THAT WORK

Terry O'Banion
Executive Director

The League for Innovation
in the Community College
Los Angeles, California

Copyright 1978

American Association of
Community and Junior Colleges
One Dupont Circle, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Printed in U.S.A.

$5 per copy

JC 790 024

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I am indebted to my colleagues Donald Bass, Chester Case, James Hammons, Marie Nock, Roland Terrell, Gordon Watts, and Carol Zion for their critique of this paper. They are leaders in the emerging field of staff development, and their views have helped immensely in the preparation of these ideas. Any error in content or style is my own.

Terry O'Banion

Produced with assistance from
the Shell Companies Foundation, Incorporated

ORGANIZING STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS THAT WORK

Staff development programs are always idiosyncratic. Designed to reflect institutional and personal needs, they may differ dramatically from one institution to another. Political realities, both internal and external, affect the nature of the staff development program. Administrative support and available funds are factors that are most important in organizing a program for staff. A staff development program that relies primarily on internal resources will be very different from one that relies primarily on external resources. And, finally, the institutional climate and the state of readiness for development in the staff will determine program activities.

Although a staff development program must and should reflect the special needs of the institution and the staff for whom it is designed, there is beginning to emerge a set of experiences for organizing a staff development program that may be helpful to most, if not all, community colleges. At this point in the state of the art it is too early to label these experiences as guidelines. With a decade of activity in staff development, and with models of exemplary programs that are beginning to develop in a few community colleges, however, it is appropriate to describe some common elements or approaches that should be considered in organizing a staff development program that really works.

ASSESSMENT

Some kind of assessment is always made preceding the initiation of a staff development program. Such assessment usually describes informally the need for the program. National activities in staff development over the last ten years will have stimulated some assessment on campus: Should we be doing what other colleges are doing? Could a staff development program help our part-time instructors? Do we get our money's worth when we send staff members to conferences and workshops? These are the kinds of assessment questions that begin to emerge as a pre-condition to the organization of a more formal staff development program. A faculty committee, dean of instruction, or president usually articulates these assessment questions, and that person or committee usually recommends a more formal assessment as a first step.

At least four kinds of assessment are helpful to make if a sound program of staff development is to be organized: assessment of (1) administrative views and support; (2) present level of staff development activities; (3) institutional and personal/professional needs; and (4) internal and external resources available to the institution. Information in all four areas should be assembled for program planners even if the information has been gathered in informal discussions, as is often the case. A formal assessment of institutional and personal/professional needs is necessary, however, if the program is to be successful in meeting staff needs.

Administrative Views and Support

The organization of a staff development program that works is a major undertaking for an institution and requires strong administrative support. Administrators are usually already supportive of any staff efforts to improve their professional abilities to instruct students. There is a generally prevalent feeling among community college administrators that universities have not adequately prepared faculty members to teach in the community college, and with the stable faculty situation today, administrators recognize the potential value of a staff development program. It is important, however, to assess the nature of their views regarding staff development and the extent to which they feel the institution is capable of supporting a major staff development effort.

An interview with the president is a necessary first step. Does the president view the present staff development activities as adequate? What ideas and plans would the president like to see implemented for the institution? Might present funds be reallocated for a well designed program or additional funds be made available? Will the president support an initial exploration of needs and resources? Will the president lend support either through a memorandum or through additional statements to the appropriate committees and groups in order to encourage staff development initiative?

A plan for assessment could be presented to the president and his first level staff for their support, which will be most important in accomplishing these first steps. If they are reluctant or cynical, then the initiator might have to begin planning a program at a very specific level, such as for student personnel staff or for part-time instructors rather than for the institution-wide program envisioned here.

Status of Staff Development Activities

Every community college in the United States participates in staff development activities, even if it consists of only one faculty member a year attending one conference. Almost all community colleges provide for a modest professional library, institutional support for staff members to attend conferences, an occasional visiting consultant, increase in salaries for faculty members who accumulate graduate credit, sabbaticals, and day-long faculty orientation sessions. All of these activities are traditional approaches to staff development that have been used by community colleges for decades. Except in a few community colleges, however, they are not organized into a well-defined, purposeful staff development program.

It is important, nevertheless, to know what the institution is currently doing. Interviews with the president, deans, department heads, and unit directors will provide information on the extent to which the institution is already offering staff development activities. If possible, the institutional budget should be examined carefully to determine, as far as possible, the exact amount of funds allocated to and used by the various units for staff development. A president often has a discretionary fund that may be the most creative source of staff development in the institution, and it should not be overlooked in the assessment. It may be difficult to separate some of the funds allocated for instructional development that also serve the purposes of staff development, but attempts to review and make judgments about these funds should be made.

It is usually surprising to institutional leaders that the college is already spending considerable funds on staff development. One institution in the Midwest, considering the organization of a formal staff development program, assessed activities and discovered that the college was spending over $100,000 a year on staff development.

Institutional and Personal/Professional Needs

The most important assessment to be made is of the institutional and personal/professional needs regarding staff development. A questionnaire is usually the approach used to assess such needs, although the Eastern Campus of Cuyahoga Community College used a faculty committee to interview all faculty members on the campus regarding their interests and needs in the area of improving teaching. Such approaches can be very effective for small colleges or for units within larger colleges. The personal interview

approach has the added advantage of building support for the program as the assessment takes place.

To organize an institution-wide program, general questionnaires are most often circulated to all faculty members. They are sometimes made specific for classified staff, part-time instructors, administrators, and other special groups. Max Raines of Michigan State University has developed an excellent questionnaire that assesses both institutional and personal/professional needs. It has been pilot-tested at Broward Community College in Florida and has been administered successfully by mail and through group interview processes.

A questionnaire to determine the interest of full-time teaching faculty and the extent to which they would be willing to participate in seminars has been developed by Michael Topper at Yavapai College in Arizona. A needs assessment instrument was also developed to assess the interest of all groups, including board members, at Oakton Community College in Illinois. Charles Novak of Olney Central College in Illinois and Barbara Barnes of Eastfield College in the Dallas County Community College District have developed assessment instruments that are used in statewide studies of staff development needs. Their instruments have been adapted for assessment at Miami-Dade Community College-North Campus and other institutions. In the last few years a number of such instruments have been made available for assessing both institutional and personal/professional needs of staff members.

Internal and External Resources

As part of the assessment of personal and professional needs of staff members, it is helpful to gather information regarding the competencies and skills of faculty members that could be made available for the staff development program. Some colleges, such as Miami-Dade Community College, rely more and more on what they label as internal consultants. The assumption is made that present faculty members have the abilities and skills necessary to teach other faculty members, and only limited resources from outside the institution are needed. Other community colleges rely almost totally on outside resources from universities and private consulting firms.

Sometimes the climate of an institution prohibits the use of internal consultants, at least in the beginning stages of a program. There are many obvious advantages to using internal consultants, however, and any program that is to

function properly should consider using the resources at hand.

In addition to internal resources, some assessment should be made of the resources from nearby universities and from special agencies. Most major business and industrial groups have well organized staff development programs. It may be possible to use some of the resources from the community, such as local chapters of the American Society for Training and Development. All of these should be carefully assessed.

Once these various assessments have been made, program planners should prepare a statement outlining views and needs discovered. With this information the program planners should be able to make a recommendation to the administration or to the appropriate committees regarding the importance and necessity of organizing a staff development program. Once institutional policy makers have approved the recommendation for a program, major effort can then be given to organizing a staff development program that really works.

STATEMENT OF PHILOSOPHY

So that the program of staff development can have a focus and so that faculty members can participate in the process of establishing that focus, a statement of philosophy is necessary. This is often a statement of need and importance as well as a statement of basic principles that will guide the program.

Statements that have emerged in the last decade often reflect the national staff development movement. Two major statements provide guidance: the report to the Congress, People For The People's College, later published as Teachers for Tomorrow: Staff Development in the Community-Junior College, and the eloquent statement prepared by Roger Garrison in New Staff for New Students, the report of the national assembly on staff development sponsored by the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. Since staff development is a "movement," these statements act to connect the local implementation of programs with this national movement. In a sense, then, local programs are confirmed by the national activities.

Once the preamble has been completed, the statement of philosophy should relate to the mission statements of the college. The college, of course, is committed to im-

proving learning for students and to providing a climate in which that learning can best take place. Staff development is a logical extension of that commitment, in that improved staff development, one hopes, leads to improved student development. It might be possible to relate mission statements of the staff development program to specific statements in the college objectives, but usually that is not necessary. A general statement linking the importance of staff development as a means for better meeting the mission of the institution is probably sufficient.

A statement of philosophy should provide the parameters for the scope of the program. In an institution-wide program it is important to recognize that staff development is for **all** staff members in the institution, including full- and part-time faculty, counselors, librarians, day and evening staff, clerical and custodial staff, para-professional staff, the president and other administrators, and even, in some cases, members of the board of trustees. If the statement of philosophy says that staff development is only for faculty, this is recognition of the important role the faculty play in the institution, but it also gives rise to the suspicion that administrators and others do not need to be developed. Statements of philosophy might also include indications that the program is a year-round, continuing program that is an integral part of the institution. As a late effort in the college scheme, attempts should be made to lodge the program as a permanent fixture.

Program planners and faculty committees should spend considerable time developing a statement of philosophy. A number of statements have now emerged that can provide some assistance. Copies of these can be obtained from other institutions for study for components that are applicable to the institution. Staff development and the need for it are not so mysterious and esoteric that special committees need to spend great amounts of precious time reinventing statements.

What is important is that once a statement has been developed, it needs careful herding through institutional pastures. Usually, a committee is responsible for developing the first draft of the statement, and it is helpful to have approval and support from a committee whose members have visibility and respect in the institution. Once approved, the statement should be shared with the faculty for their review. This is a most important step since approval from the faculty is absolutely necessary if the staff development program — designed for their needs — is going to be accepted. Comments should be asked for in written form and a special session held for the faculty in which the docu-

ment can be discussed. The session could be part of a regular faculty meeting or, if the college is particularly large, a special session might be held for those who are interested.

Along with the statement of philosophy it might be helpful to have faculty review some of the results of the assessment process so they can learn why it is important to have staff development programs. If the assessment process underscores that importance, and if the statement of philosophy is sound, faculty members are likely to endorse it, although they will have numerous questions regarding the organization of the program, the reward system, requirements, and whether or not staff development is going to be related to their evaluation. Some written statement regarding how these other elements are to be considered would be helpful to allay their concern. Once faculty members have approved the basic statement of philosophy, planners can then move ahead in designing the program.

ORGANIZATION AND STAFFING

Staff development programs are still very new in community colleges, and patterns of how they should be organized have not yet emerged with any agreement. John A. Centra completed a study for Educational Testing Service in November, 1976, and reported data on staff development programs in 326 two-year colleges. Forty-nine percent of the colleges had some unit or person responsible for staff development or instructional improvement. The median number of years these units had existed was only 2.5. Fifty-six percent of the two-year colleges with units had single, full-time directors, 14 percent had two or three full-time staff, and 18 percent had four or more staff members.

Charles R. Novak and Barbara K. Barnes report in two studies of staff development practices in Illinois and Florida that there is no agreement regarding patterns of organization. "Clearly, there is no consensus regarding who should be responsible for staff development programs. Not only are all groups reluctant to name any mode of operations as desirable, but the polarity of their views on this subject is more pronounced than it was on other topics."

At this early stage, while there appears to be no agreement regarding organization, it is quite clear that someone must be in charge if the program is to work. Consideration must be given to the political realities and resources available within each institution. If there is a strong faculty union,

then there is likely to be a push for control and direction by a faculty committee. If the administration has initiated the program and gives it strong support, there is likely to be a push for a coordinator who would report to either the president or one of the deans, most likely the dean of instruction.

Advisory Committee

Regardless of the organizational pattern selected for the institution, an advisory committee of personnel representing the various units for which staff development is to be planned would be politically expedient and educationally sound. An overall coordinating committee is sometimes used, such as that developed at Eastfield College of the Dallas County Community College District. At Eastfield a staff member from each of the various units representing part-time staff, full-time faculty, administrators, etc., works as a committee to coordinate the overall direction of the program. In any case, an advisory committee should have input and approve the direction of the staff development program. Staff development programs that really work cause changes in institutions and are likely on occasion to become controversial. The support of an institution-wide committee will be most helpful in better planning and in providing support when the going gets rough.

As the program evolves and grows it is not likely that quality coordination can be exercised by committees. Usually, a member of the committee emerges as a leader and is given released time or the committee recommends that some faculty member be appointed with released time to coordinate the activities in staff development. At Northampton County Area Community College in Pennsylvania, an eight-member group provided initial direction for the program. The group eventually selected one of the members as chairperson, and the institution provided released time for that individual.

Some colleges opt for a decentralized approach to staff development, operating the program through the existing directors and coordinators of the various units. In this plan of organization, division chairpersons and/or deans and directors usually provide the leadership. If there is strong support from the administration, if funds are available, and if these various unit heads are provided assistance in planning staff development programs, then this organization can work. Too often, however, unit heads are assigned the staff development function in addition to all their other responsibilities, and the staff development function is

often slighted because of a lack of time or experience. If the program is to be decentralized, it is necessary to provide some staff development activities for unit heads to help them know how to plan and carry out programs for their areas.

Full-time Coordinator

In the view of the author, the most feasible organization for a staff development program that works is one coordinated by a full-time staff development person. This person should report to the president of the institution if the program is to be a true institution-wide program. In some institutions it may be appropriate for the staff development coordinator to report to the dean of instruction or to the chief administrator of the academic program. An advisory committee of the faculty or of staff members representing the various units can certainly lend assistance and strong support for the program.

One of the difficulties of organizing the program under the direction of a single staff member is that few staff members are qualified to provide such leadership. The University of California at Berkeley offered the first course specifically for coordinators of staff development in community colleges in 1973, and each year thereafter at the University of Illinois. In the last few years several other universities have begun to offer courses and seminars for the specific preparation of staff development coordinators for community colleges. These are only modest attempts and in no way can they entirely prepare a person for the task of coordinating rather complex staff development programs.

Staff development coordinators are usually selected because they have emerged as faculty leaders or as staff members with specific skills in instructional development or human relationships. They are often people who are respected and trusted by the faculty. They are interested in their own continuing professional development, and are willing to take on a new task that has little professional identity. Many of them have direct skills to offer faculty, but most eventually spend their time managing and coordinating a program and using the skills of others.

There is an emerging staff development professional, however. The educational development officer has emerged as a professional with competencies in instructional design and development, and a staff development facilitator has emerged as a person with skills in teacher supervision, management development, human relations

skills, consultation, and sometimes evaluation skills. The National Council for Staff, Program, and Organizational Development (NCSPOD) was organized under the auspices of AACJC in the fall of 1977, and the continuing professionalization of this group will likely result in a growing core of staff development professionals who are skilled for the task. A number of states are also in the process of organizing state associations of staff development professionals.

The Florida Department of Education is involved in an effort to develop competencies for various leadership positions in education, including staff and program development coordinators. The NCSPOD is also planning to organize a national research project that will identify and validate competencies for staff development professionals.

In the beginning, the staff development coordinator may offer direct services to faculties through workshops on writing behavioral objectives, leading group discussions, or the nature of community college students. As the program takes shape, however, the coordinator will provide fewer direct services and will begin to devote more time to management.

Program Staff

One important source of staff for the program is the staff at the community college. Some system should be developed for identifying staff members who have expertise to share with their colleagues. At some colleges these staff members are called internal consultants and are given released time to provide such activities. The staff member who teaches a course to colleagues may have that course assigned as part of the regular teaching load. If internal consultants are used for weekend retreats and summer activities, they may be paid for these extra services. The Florida Junior College at Jacksonville pays internal consultants an hourly rate commensurate with their educational level. In any case, an assessment of the internal resources will reveal excellent consultants who can provide outstanding services for the program. The added advantage is that these internal consultants already know the institution and its problems, and when asked to assist in this direct way by helping their colleagues, their own positions are enhanced and their participation is a kind of advanced staff development for them.

Depending upon the size of the institution, it will be necessary to consider adding additional full-time staff members as the program grows. If the college decides to

make a major effort to direct the institution into behavioral objectives for classes and management by objectives, a specialist in this area may need to be employed to assist staff members in making these changes. In larger institutions of 10,000 or more students, additional staff members will be needed to provide services to complement the work of the coordinator if the program is to be effective.

A number of community colleges have instructional development specialists, usually assigned to the learning resource center. These staff members can provide very important services for improving instruction, which is a major part of a good staff development program. Relationships should be worked out with this unit to insure that these specialists are available to assist with the staff development program, since the purposes of staff development and instructional development obviously overlap a great deal.

External consultants are also useful for specific tasks when these activities are carefully planned and when follow-up activities are initiated by the local staff development professionals. It is a poor use of funds to bring consultants in for single speeches or for one day visits when these are not part of some coordinated program. When consultants are used to stimulate new thinking or to affirm some ongoing activities, they can certainly be useful. When consultants bring new ideas to receptive groups who have been charged with examining those ideas for possible implementation in the institution, there can be considerable institutional payoff. Further, when consultants are brought in to teach specific skills or to assess specific programs these activities can be of value to the institution if there is some follow-through on the recommendations.

If staff development programs are to be successful, then, the institution must develop its own internal resources to be used on a continuing basis. An occasional shot in the arm by an outside consultant can be helpful, but it is no replacement for a well developed in-house staff development program.

PROGRAM OF ACTIVITIES

The program of activities is derived from the assessment of needs and interests of those for whom the program is planned and from the mission, needs, and priorities of the institution. The program format will depend upon institutional resources, expectations of participants, and the creativity of the staff development coordinator.

Some community colleges think of the staff development program as a curriculum. A curriculum is a set of designed experiences for the development of students so it can also be a set of designed experiences for the development of the staff. If the program is conceived as a curriculum, the primary work is to develop a series of courses, seminars, and workshops that will be attractive to the participants. Except in very unusual circumstances the offerings will be electives to be selected by the staff members in terms of their own perceived needs and interests. The courses are sometimes listed in the catalog along with the courses for students, and in this way become part of the recognized and approved activity of the institution.

Such courses as Improving the Lecture, Preparing Tests, Understanding Minority Students, Writing Behavioral Objectives, Using Humor in the Classroom, Managing Confrontation, Using Audio-Visual Aids, etc., are often offered for course credit and taught by internal consultants. The courses have objectives and a plan of activities and sometimes a syllabus. Staff members who complete the courses are sometimes awarded credit that applies on the salary schedule or toward promotion in academic rank. Courses offered institutional managers may include Time Management, Planning and Budgeting, Evaluating Staff, Decision Making, Leadership, and Supervision. A curriculum for classified staff might include such courses as Improving Typing, Shorthand, Introduction to the College, Philosophy of the Community College, Community Relationships, and Interpersonal Skills.

Colleges' experience in organizing curriculums for students can be helpful in designing curriculums for staff. In this way the staff development program is clearly visible and fairly well understood. Staff members sign up for courses, complete experiences, and learn what they wish to learn. They accumulate credit and see benefits in terms of experiences completed. Courses are offered as long as participants continue to enroll. Once the needs of the present staff are met, courses are dropped from the curriculum and new ones are added, along with seminars and workshops.

In the curriculum approach new faculty members are sometimes required to participate in a course such as Introduction to the Philosophy of the Community College. Sometimes departments will strongly recommend that members of the department participate in a course or workshop that is important for the direction that the department is taking. At Los Medanos College in California, new faculty participate in a semester-long program before they begin teach-

ing. Funded by the W. K. Kellogg Foundation and directed by Chester Case, the program has been a most creative experiment.

Program Materials

Some institutions have developed extensive materials for staff development in the curriculum mode. For example, the Maricopa County Community College District has developed a series of self-instructional materials for part-time staff of the district. The materials cover a variety of topics, some mentioned above, and are recognized by the state as fulfilling the requirements for certification. At De-Anza College in California, TV tapes are available for part-time staff on special topics the college has deemed important for that group. The League for Innovation in the Community College received a grant beginning in the fall of 1978 to work with these two colleges and others to develop these materials for use by other community colleges.

The curricular approach is easily conceived and provides a comfortable and attractive structure for the participants. There are many additional approaches, however, that can add creativity to a comprehensive program of staff development.

Grants to staff members for special projects can be a very effective form of staff development. Matching institutional needs and individual needs of staff members with financial support from the institution or from external agencies can result in improved programs at many levels of the institution. A number of colleges have allocated special funds for grants to staff members to improve teaching practices, to develop new courses, or to improve the management of various units.

The Peralta Community College District in California allocated at one point over $100,000 for special faculty grants to improve teaching. Faculty members must apply to a special review committee for these funds and the project must be of benefit to the institution. Faculty members are provided guidelines for the development of proposals, and committees make awards of modest sums for the proposals that are most promising. Over a period of time such institutional grants can contribute significantly to the improvement of educational practices. Special attention, however, must be given to the implementation of findings or the result of these grants will be very limited. A number of colleges use this approach as a way of rewarding creative and energetic staff members who want to contribute to institutional development.

A most creative approach to the grants program of staff development has been under way for some time at Santa Fe Community College in Florida. The dean for development at Santa Fe works with faculty members to help them prepare proposals for funding from federal, state, local, and private sources. In 1976 the college reported on 32 projects that had been funded for almost $4 million from external funds. The programs represented a great variety of new program development in such areas as health related and career development programs. A number of grants from the State of Florida contributed to the purchase of equipment, local conferences, and even assistance to local high schools. While the projects were greatly diverse, they were, nevertheless, offered to the college under the rubric of a staff development program. In this way the college is making a statement about the importance of staff development at many levels of college operation.

Methods of Improving Teaching

Improving teaching practices is probably the most important concern of faculty members in community colleges. Too often, staff development activities are only indirectly related to improving teaching. A direct approach to improving teaching involves monitoring teaching practices and exploring new styles and approaches. Two approaches can serve as examples of the possibilities in this area.

At Jamestown Community College in New York a counselor in an informal discussion of teaching suggested to a history teacher that it might be helpful to view oneself on television in the teaching process. The history teacher agreed and invited the counselor to tape him while he taught his history course. As the relationship between the two developed, the counselor offered to give feedback about the teacher's style. The counselor pointed out listening modes, interaction patterns, thought processes, examples of humor, and examples of non-verbal communication. The history teacher would review the feedback and the film with an eye toward improving his style. This is a simple, direct approach to improving teaching practices and could be easily and inexpensively organized in almost any community college in the country. Such activities, of course, require considerable trust on the part of the participants and skill on the part of those who provide feedback.

A similar but more formal team approach was developed at Ohlone College in California. Four or five faculty members agreed to participate in a continuing process to

review their teaching styles. After establishing a level of trust and openness about their teaching styles under the direction of a leader, participants are asked to teach the group any specific topic of their choice for one minute. Following the one minute presentation the group gives feedback to the teacher. The time is increased to five minutes for subsequent presentations, and eventually participants are visiting classes and giving feedback and suggestions on real class sessions. Sessions are also taped for television and this additional information is helpful to the participating teachers. This approach is particularly helpful because it provides a true supportive core of interested colleagues in which one can explore and practice new approaches to teaching. It has the added advantage of having input from four or five additional experienced colleagues. This kind of approach has the potential for revitalizing an entire institution and making significant contributions to teaching effectiveness.

When staff members visit other colleges to review innovative or exemplary programs, they always find ideas they want to implement on their own campuses. When these visitations are carefully designed to gather ideas and to bring them back to the campus for review and possible implementation, such activities can form the basis for an important part of a staff development program that really works.

Both Delta College in Michigan and Moraine Valley Community College in Illinois have developed this approach most successfully. Both colleges have sent teams of staff members representing administrators, faculty members, and classified staff to other community colleges to review programs they have learned about through the literature or that have been identified for them as programs of outstanding quality. On these visitations the team follows a careful format gathering information and preparing it for reports back home. Copies of materials are obtained and contacts with those who have implemented the program are made for possible follow-up.

This approach has the advantage of a core of support for an idea. When an individual discovers an idea off campus and attempts to bring it home, there is often difficulty in implementing the idea because others do not understand it or do not support it as enthusiastically. When a core of people support an idea, it has much more likelihood of being implemented on campus. In addition, the sense of community that develops among those making the visits can also have important implications for the campus climate. These team members often become campus leaders

who are quite knowledgeable because they have been exposed to a variety of ideas on a variety of campuses. The program has been so successful at Delta College in the past that in the winter of 1978 special visitations were made to review staff development programs on other community college campuses.

Off-Campus Activities

It has been usual practice at most community colleges to send staff members to off-campus conferences, workshops, and meetings of professional associations. These can be most helpful in providing sources for new ideas, in gathering actual written materials to return to the campus, and in making contacts with other professionals interested in the same problems. Such meetings keep a campus in touch with national movements and activities and insure that the local campus will not become provincial. For the individuals attending the meetings it is often a time of personal renewal with old associates and an opportunity to be stimulated regarding new ideas and approaches. The rewards for the institution, however, are often left to chance and there is sometimes a general feeling that such meetings are not particularly valuable for the institution.

Attendance at off-campus conferences, workshops, and meetings of professional associations, however, could be of great benefit to the local campus. The staff development coordinator should be informed beforehand regarding those who are attending such meetings and the kinds of meetings attended. This can be easily accomplished if copies of whatever forms are used to approve such activities are sent to the staff development office. The staff development coordinator, then, should contact those who plan to attend meetings and ask them to gather information that would be of use to the institution. In many cases participants should be encouraged to offer workshops upon their return for those who did not attend — especially if it is an extensive workshop or one that will train them in some new ideas and new approaches. In one sense those attending conferences should be seen as internal consultants. As part of their responsibility for attending workshops and conferences, they should bring home something of value to their colleagues. This approach has worked quite effectively at Miami-Dade Community College in Florida and can work effectively on most community college campuses.

The day-long or weekend retreat can be a very intensive experience that can contribute significantly to institu-

tional and staff development goals. Sometimes it is helpful to assemble the entire college or special groups in the college to focus intensely on a special problem. Retreats are often used to build a sense of community and to encourage a sense of renewal in the college.

At Broward Community College in Florida an evening and day-long retreat has been used to build a sense of campus community. Flathead Valley Community College in Montana has used yearly retreats to open the college in the fall and to develop a sense of commonality around the goals for the year. The Peralta Community College District in California holds an administrative retreat for all five campuses and the District Office as a way of exploring new ideas in administration and management and as a way of building a common purpose in the group. Significant changes in improved teaching, increased grants, and improved service have been documented at Jamestown Community College because of an intensive retreat for the staff.

Retreats can be held to train for special skills or used as a problem-solving activity. They are effective for a variety of purposes and should be considered for special needs in a well-rounded staff development program.

Graduate study is probably the most traditional staff development practice. All professional staff members have participated in graduate study and sometimes as many as one-third to one-half of the professional staff continue to participate in graduate study. If the program of graduate study is more than simply an accumulation of credits that improve the salary, it can be an important part of a creative staff development program.

The Dallas County Community College District and the Tarrant County Community College District, both in Texas, have used graduate study quite effectively as part of their staff development programs. They organized a graduate career development center (no longer in operation) for their staff members, with assistance from a number of universities in Texas. The universities offer graduate credit for courses identified as needs by the local faculty and the courses are offered on the campuses of the community colleges. This kind of coordination helps insure that the graduate study will be useful to the institution and to the staff members in the community college.

Other Activities

There are a number of other activities that should be considered in a well-rounded program of staff development. Sabbaticals, of course, are also traditional forms of staff development. They provide intensive opportunities for improved professional development and should be seen in that light. Sabbatical proposals should be carefully reviewed and approved leaves monitored to insure that the institution is rewarded in what business and industry see as a most generous and unusual practice of educational institutions. Mini-sabbaticals of two to four weeks have been used by colleges in the ACCTion Consortium quite effectively.

Faculty exchange programs offer additional intensive opportunities for individual faculty members to gain considerably from working in another institution. When such exchanges are only sporadic, however, they are not likely to have much impact on the institution. At Brevard Community College in Florida there is an intensive effort under way to develop an international exchange program for fairly large numbers of staff members. These efforts are likely to result in real impact on staff development. AACJC has also organized an exchange program that includes Canadian colleges.

The professional library is standard in most institutions. If the staff development program is successful in stimulating faculty members to review new ideas and practice new approaches, then the professional library becomes crucial to a staff development program that really works. If the professional library is one small shelf of classics on the community college, it is not likely to provide the support necessary for creative and energetic staff.

All of the above activities can be considered part of a well-organized staff development program. A college rich in resources can attempt to offer opportunities in all these activities. Sometimes the program will emphasize one approach over another, but just as colleges provide for the individual needs of students, so must they provide for the individual needs of staff members. Thus a diverse program of activities is required for the various needs of the staff.

A professional development plan is sometimes used to help staff members consider their own objectives and to assist them in selecting from the wide variety of developmental activities that are available. The plan usually consists of the staff member's objectives for a year, or sometimes even for five years, noting priorities of interests and needs in areas of professional development and some-

times in the area of personal development. The plan may be reviewed and approved by an immediate supervisor and when collected throughout the institution can form the basis for planning staff development activities to be offered. The College of the Mainland in Texas has developed this approach quite effectively.

Once individuals have completed professional development plans, departments and divisions can review them with an eye towards organizing appropriate group activities where objectives of staff members overlap. In addition, departments and divisions can encourage certain institutional objectives to be included in the individual plan and in this way both institutional and personal/professional needs are met.

One major advantage of the professional development plan is that it provides a basis for evaluating outcomes in terms of personal and professional objectives. Another advantage of the professional development plan is that it encourages ownership of the program on an individual basis. If staff members are simply encouraged to select from a smorgasbord of activities, many of them will not participate at all. When they are encouraged or even required to prepare professional development plans, they then must review their own needs and interests and must become acquainted with the program of staff development. The professional development plan, of course, is no guarantee of involvement or success, but it is one approach that has worked in a number of community colleges.

INCENTIVES AND REWARDS

There is an assumption that staff members must be induced to participate in staff development activities. While this may not have been true several decades ago, the teaching profession has changed to the point that staff members often raise the question of incentives and rewards at the very beginning of any new activity. For colleges that have faculty unions it is a very open question and one that is likely to end up on the bargaining table.

What kinds of rewards should staff members receive for participation? The possibilities include released time, promotions, direct stipends, salary increases, institutional recognition, and paid travel. The opportunity to participate in personal and professional growth activities provided by the institution is also a very important incentive. In fact, it is one

of the most important incentives in a staff development program and one that must not be overlooked.

In a 1977 study of staff development programs in Florida and Illinois by Novak and Barnes, all groups studied (division chairpersons, student personnel staff, administrators, and faculty members) viewed personal and professional growth as the most desirable incentive and reward for participation in staff development activities. Serious discussions with staff members about their own needs and interests will likely reveal the same perceptions. Staff members want to grow and develop; they will likely view with optimism any creative opportunities given them.

While personal and professional growth certainly is an important incentive, an effective program cannot ignore other methods for providing incentives and rewards. There is very little agreement, however, among the various constituencies in the institution as to which rewards produce the best results.

For example, faculty members and division chairpersons in the Florida and Illinois studies felt that they should be awarded salary increases or monetary stipends for participation in staff development activities, but administrators disagreed. They rejected the idea of increments and stipends perhaps because they felt that staff development is part of the regular activities of staff members.

Released time is often viewed as an important reward for staff development. In the Florida study cited above, however, faculty members and student personnel workers perceived released time as a highly desirable incentive, but administrators did not. The problem of developing a reward system that works for an institution is obviously a very difficult one and should be approached carefully to insure support on the part of the various constituencies. As part of the early needs assessment, it is important to discover which rewards are perceived positively in the institution so that these can be built into the program.

There is one approach to rewards and incentives that avoids the difficulties that develop from these different perceptions regarding value. At Cuyahoga Community College in Ohio and Miami-Dade Community College in Florida, point systems have been developed that relate to a variety of activities of staff members during a given year. The programs at Cuyahoga and Miami-Dade are well worth reviewing for the specifics, but generally they work in this manner. To be considered for continuing employment a staff member must earn a minimum of 100 points for a year. Established numbers of points are given for teaching classes, for preparation time, and for participation in col-

lege committees and functions. In addition, staff members may obtain a certain number of limited points for participation in community service and staff development activities. In this way staff development becomes an attractive alternative for faculty members, as well as a way to accumulate the necessary points.

Briefly stated, this description does not do justice to the well formulated programs at Cuyahoga and Miami-Dade. It is used only to give an example of a concept that should be explored if institutions want to design staff development programs that really work.

FUNDING

Given the present fiscal constraints in education, the cost of staff development activities is a concern of all community colleges. At a time when programs are being curtailed and even eliminated, it is difficult for planners to think of adding a new program — especially one that does not result in direct services to students.

One of the first steps that must be taken is an assessment of the present level of funding in the institution. As pointed out in the section on assessment, the institution is probably already spending a great deal on staff development without calling it that. Once the pieces of the program are gathered and the present funding known, it may be possible to recast the pieces into a more useful program using present funds. In most institutions, however, additional funds have generally been required.

Centra's study of two-year colleges indicates that 70 percent of all staff development funds come from institutional general funds. Grants from the federal government or foundations amount to 16 percent, and direct funds from the state amount to 11 percent. Three percent comes from such sources as alumni or special funds.

In recent years several states have made special allocations for staff development activities in community colleges. The most noted example is Florida, where two percent of the colleges' operating budgets from the previous year is made available for the staff development program. If the funds are not used in one year they may be carried over into the next fiscal year and can be expended only on staff development activities. In Florida, therefore, the budgets for staff development have been the best in the nation. For example, in 1977-78 the Florida Junior College at Jacksonville had a staff development budget of $470,200.

The California Community Junior College Association sponsored a bill that would have appropriated $1,575,000 over three years for staff development programs in California community colleges. Senate Bill 907 in 1977 passed both houses of the legislature and was widely supported by community college groups, organizations, and individuals in California. Governor Jerry Brown, however, vetoed the bill and noted in his veto message that existing state funds are sufficient to allow in-service training and staff development and that direct state funding would be an inappropriate and unnecessary assumption of local responsibility.

Most colleges, as indicated in Centra's study, have assumed local responsibility for funding staff development programs. By setting up special units, colleges have made considerable contributions to staff development. Even if no special funds are provided for additional activities, the creation of the office to coordinate activities at the existing fund level is a positive step.

Special Funds

A number of colleges have set up special funds to support special projects. At the Coast Community College District and the Peralta Community College District, both in California, chancellors have designated special funds to support staff projects designed primarily to improve instruction. Such special allocations add considerably to a staff development program.

It is also possible to get state reimbursement for staff development activities by offering such activities as courses in the college. Just as community colleges provide continuing professional services for local physicians, lawyers, real estate agents, and public school teachers, so they can also provide continuing education for their own staff members. Some colleges even list staff development courses in their catalogs, granting credit for their faculty and receiving state reimbursement on a formula basis.

At one of the St. Louis Community Colleges a faculty association that lost a collective bargaining election to another group decided to continue as a staff development unit. The funds in the association and additional funds to be contributed as dues will provide a funding base for staff development activities contributed directly by staff members.

Many community colleges have joined efforts in consortia to provide for staff development. While consortia have many purposes, staff development is always a by-product and often a major purpose. Usually low membership dues

result in a considerable payoff in terms of resource exchange and staff development. The New Jersey Consortium on the Community College, the Western North Carolina Consortium, ACCTion, and the League for Innovation in the Community College are examples of the varieties of consortia sponsored by community colleges. These consortia share consultants, hold conferences, exchange staff members, share resources, hold campus visitations, and cooperate on projects as a way of providing staff development.

While funding is certainly a problem, board members can support the use of funds for staff development when the case is presented well. As noted in the 1973 report of the Assembly of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, entitled New Staff for New Students:

> The staff of a college is its single greatest resource. In economic terms, the staff is the college's most significant and largest capital investment. In these terms alone, we affirm that it is only good sense that the investment should be helped to appreciate in value and not be allowed to wear itself out or slide into obsolescence by inattention or neglect.

Given that view, it is imperative that community colleges review their current operation regarding staff development and organize a program on a sound and appropriately funded basis. It may be the best investment the college can make; surely, the maintenance of staff is as important as the maintenance of buildings and grounds.

PROGRAM EVALUATION

Staff development is a new function in the community college and to date most of the concern has been on planning and implementing programs. While evaluation is considered important, there has not been much time to evalute since most of the programs have been organized in the last two or three years. In Centra's study, of the 326 two-year colleges reporting, only 19 percent had done a fairly thorough evaluation of the program.

Thirty-five percent had done a partial evaluation, and 42 percent had done no evaluation at all. Interestingly, only 10 percent of the 315 four-year colleges responding had done a thorough evaluation, and only 12 percent of the 93 universities reported evaluations, compared to 19 percent in two-year colleges.

The Florida Division of Community Colleges, responsible for administering state staff development funds, organized

an evaluation system that could easily be adapted in most community colleges. For each staff development activity at an institution the State Division requires the following information:

1. Title of the project
2. Specific objectives stated in performance terms
3. Program planning budgetary system
4. Amounts budgeted and spent on the activity

In addition, the campus staff development director must report whether the activity was ever started, abandoned, completed, or still in process. The director must also report on whether the procedure for achieving the specific objectives is successful and whether or not these objectives are met. Finally, a narrative evaluation for each project, including the results achieved and indications to what degree the project was related to the college's five-year goals plan for staff and program development, must be submitted to the State Division of Community Colleges. Specific approaches to evaluation are determined by the individual campus, but this overall approach encourages careful evaluation. One of the more limiting factors in this scheme is that it relies heavily on subjective reports from the director. Gathering other indices of evaluation requires more time, but it is certainly worth the effort if the program's effectiveness is to be determined.

Levels of Evaluation

There are three levels of evaluation of outcomes that should be considered in designing an evalution plan for any staff development program. Indices of outcomes in the first level include such simple counting devices as participation and attendance. The number of faculty members participating in activities over a period of time will give important feedback about the value of the activity and whether or not it should be continued. Attendance in a continuing seminar is an important index of staff members' interests. While these are basic indices of values, they are, nevertheless, most important for overall program evaluation and should be gathered systematically.

Direct feedback from participants on questionnaires regarding the value of the activity is another important and basic approach to evaluation. Did you enjoy this activity? Did it help you consider ways to improve your teaching? Would you recommend this activity to other colleagues in the institution? These kinds of questions can provide good

information on the value of staff development activities. In addition, questionnaires on how to improve or change the staff development activities are important. Was the activity too long? Were the objectives clear? Did the leader provide information that was helpful? Was the leader's presentation style appropriate to your learning needs? These kinds of questions and many others can be used to improve the design of activities. They are common approaches known to all educators in terms of improving learning experiences for students.

The second level of evaluation is an attempt to discern changes in staff members as the result of the development program. Evaluation at this level becomes more complex. If the program is successful, it is assumed that there will be changes in the behavior of staff members. They will have new understanding of and attitudes towards students. They will manage more effectively. They will type more efficiently. They will listen more attentively. They will relate more warmly and openly. These are some examples of the value outcomes that have been suggested for staff development programs. It is difficult to measure such changes because it is difficult to control the variables in this occasional process. Some faculty members will resist such evaluation. There is an underlying fear in some staff members that the development activity will be related to their promotion and tenure.

The most non-threatening approach to measuring changes at the second level of evaluation is self reports in which staff members determine the changes in their knowledge, attitudes, and style that are related to their participation in staff development activities. Follow-up of faculty members with interviews or a questionnaire may reveal changes. If the staff development activity has been specific and intensive, and if the learnings can be directly applied to classroom or management situations, then obviously changes will be easier to measure.

If a faculty member has participated in an intensive series of sessions on writing instructional objectives, it is not too difficult to gather information — if the staff member is willing — regarding whether or not instructional objectives are now used in teaching. If an administrator has participated in a carefully designed program in time management, he or she will likely be willing to report on the use of some of those learnings. If a librarian has visited a number of other campuses to review new ways of accessing books, he or she can report on new ideas discovered and implemented. A questionnaire sometimes works for this purpose but interviews with selected samples of staff members will likely reveal more useful data.

Gathering Data

The professional development plan can be quite helpful in gathering data at this second level of evaluation. In the professional development plan, a staff member provides information — whether self report, peer evaluation, student evaluation, or supervisory evaluation — as evidence for the achievement of objectives. The professional development plan encourages a self evaluation mode in the individual staff member, and if staff members are provided staff development opportunities to help them organize better, professional development plans evaluation will be greatly improved. If a variety of indices of evaluation are built into the professional development plans, a summation of these indices at the end of a year or by division or department will provide very important data to be used in the overall program evaluation.

The use of peer, student, and supervisor evaluation raises the level of sophistication. If students are used as pre- and post-test evaluators for the faculty member's development in certain instructional areas, these data can help corroborate self reported changes. Peer evaluation can be most effective in reporting developmental changes in colleagues, but it requires special attention.

The difficulty in evaluation at the second level is that participation depends upon the climate of the institution. If the institution is an open, encouraging, and creative one in which staff members trust one another and in which there are good relationships between faculty and administrators, and among classified staff, administrators, and faculty, then staff members are more willing to be examined closely. If the institutional environment is one of mistrust and even open hostility, these approaches simply cannot work, regardless of the sophistication of the instruments and of the evaluators.

The use of experimental design and outside evaluators is not discussed here because such approaches require more sophistication than most community colleges can accommodate at the present level of staff development programs. As programs emerge and become more secure, more sophisticated devices for evaluation can be used.

There is a third level of evaluation that requires more sophistication than that possessed by even highly competent researchers in universities. There is general agreement that the purpose of staff development is to lead to improved student development. The thesis can be stated in this way: staff development leads to improved program development and organization development which lead to improved student development. If staff development is

successful, there will be changes in the institution; those changes will show up in changes in programs, including new ways to organize the curriculum, and in improvement in instructional processes. Furthermore, there will be changes in organizational development as a response to the developing needs of staff and the new need brought about by changes in curriculum and instruction. It is assumed that all these changes, if they are indeed improvements, lead to improved student development — that is, students learn more — or they are more likely to achieve the developmental goals that are common to all human beings.

The difficulty of measurement in this construct is that there are too many variables between staff development and student development. The treatments of staff development are not specific enough at present to relate them precisely to improvement in organizational and program development. As staff development continues to emerge as a new priority in the community college, however, educators will improve their skills. In the future they may be able to make links between improved staff development and improved student development.

Regardless of the level of evaluation, major questions must be resolved early in the program if it is to work. Should participation in staff development activities be taken into account in promotion and tenure? At the present time most authors writing about staff development suggest that evaluation for promotion and tenure should be clearly separated from the staff development program. There is concern that the fledgling staff development program will get entangled in the negative aspects of the traditional staff evaluation program. Others argue that staff development and staff evaluation are two sides of the same coin and insist that institutions deal with the integration of the two activities.

In healthy institutions it is probably possible to integrate staff development and staff evaluation activities. It is a goal worth pursuing, since both activities obviously pertain to improving the personal and professional development of staff. But if such an integration threatens staff development programs so that participation is limited or creates cynicism, then the two programs should be kept separate and the separation made clear to staff members.

In summary, to organize a staff development program that works, a community college must go through the following steps that can be considered emerging guidelines:

1. Assessment should be made of administrative views and support, of present level of staff development activities, of institutional and professional/personal needs, and of resources within and near the institution.

2. A statement of philosophy for the staff development program should be developed and approved by the members of the institution for which the program is designed.
3. An organization for the staff development program must be designed appropriate for the limitations and resources of the institution. The organization must include a competent staff to carry out the coordinating function.
4. A wide variety of activities must be designed to meet the various needs of all the constituencies represented in the institution.
5. Appropriate incentives and rewards must be made clear and available to the participants.
6. An adequate level of funding must be made available to carry out the activities.
7. There must be an evaluation of the overall program, including indications of improvement in the development of individual staff members.

Close attention to these steps will help insure the organization of staff development programs that actually work. Staff development is one of the best opportunities community colleges have had in decades for meeting their overall aims and purposes. Student development is the major goal. Staff development is a promising means for reaching that goal.

References

Centra, John A. **Faculty Development Practices in U.S. Colleges and Universities.** Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, November 1976.

Novak, Charles R. and Barnes, Barbara K. "Florida and Illinois: Views on Staff Development" in **Developing Staff Potential (ed.)** Terry O'Banion, **New Dimensions for Community Colleges.** San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.

O'Banion, Terry. "Staff Development: A New Priority for the Seventies," in The **College Board Review,** No. 99, spring 1976.

Yarrington, Roger (ed.). **New Staff for New Students,** Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1973.